

9

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/627,902	07/25/2003	Roger Moons	AD6883USNA 3469		
	7590 09/27/2007 DE NEMOLIDS AND COM	EXAMINER			
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			BECKER, DREW E		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1761		
•			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/27/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/627,902	MOONS, ROGER		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Drew E. Becker	1761		

	Drew E. Becker		1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover si	heet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN	CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an a ice of Appeal (with e with 37 CFR 1.11	amendment, aff appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) ter than SIX MONTHS b). ONLY CHECK BO	S from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corres hortened statutory per than three months aft	ponding amount riod for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ision thereof (37 CF	R 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) — They raise new issues that would require further core (b) — They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) — They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) — They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling and the present additional claims. 	nsideration and/or s v); er form for appeal t	earch (see NO	TE below);	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	the ODP rejection	over 11/438,51	<u>8</u> .	`
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		•		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejectio	ns under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the	claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place th	e application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper	No(s)		•
			v	· .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the WO 01/34702A2 did not provide a thermal conductivity of 1.0 W/mK. However, WO 01/34702A2 taught a carbon fibers and carbon black of up to 10% and applicant does not claim a minimum amount of filler. In addition, page 4, line 5 of applicant's specification states that "Typically the high thermal conductivity filler is about 5 toabout 65% by weight of the composition." Therefore, the material of WO 01/34702A2 inherently provided the desired properties. Applicant argues that Nakamichi did not teach a sufficient amount of filler. However, Nakamichi teaches an amount of inorganic filler, such as carbon black and carbon fiber (column 3, line 53), in the amount of 10-90% of the glass fiber (column 3, line 67), with the glass fiber making up 20-70% of the composition (column 4, line 1). Clearly, 90% of 70% is 63%. Therefore, Nakamichi teaches the use of 63% carbon fiber or carbon black. Nakamichi also teaches a minimum inorganic filler content of 40% (column 4, line 18). In addition, page 4, line 5 of applicant's specification states that "Typically the high thermal conductivity filler is about 5 to about 65% by weight of the composition." Applicant argues that Nakamichi included a "laundry list" of inorganic fillers. However, Nakamichi only listed 14 suggested choices with two of them being carbon black and carbon fibers. The terminal disclaimer filed on 9/11/07 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of application 11/438,518 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded. Applicant argues that Nakamichi et al only taught 2-25% filler and that 25% "may be enough to give the required thermal conductivity" and that Nakamichi et al.

DREW BECKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER